DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 498 UD 019 589

TITLE	1979 Special Report on the NIE Compensatory Education Study.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	55p.; For related documents see ED 160 692, ED 161 996 and UD 019 666
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Alternative Schools; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Educational Accountability; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; Parent Associations; Parent Participation; Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This document examines the National Institute of Education's (NIE) Final Report on its study of compensatory education. Objectives of the NIE study and strategies used by NIE to accomplish these objectives are summarized. The five main chapters of the Final Report dealing respectively with demonstration studies, teacher training, the Instructional Dimensions follow-up, Title I parent advisory councils, and the local administration of Title I are reviewed. The Report is criticized for not acknowledging the National Advisory Council (NAC) role in the study and for its omission of information about nonpublic school participation in Title I programs. Criticism is also expressed over the lack of information in the NIE report concerning specific approaches for improving the effectiveness of compensatory education programs. This criticism is used as the basis for presenting the NAC's recommendations regarding Title I programs in the following areas: (1) future NIE studies; (2) educational research; (3) information utilization and dissemination; (4) program evaluations; (5) summer school programs; (6) secondary schools; (7) alternative schools; (8) nonpublic schools; (9) parent participation; and (10) program administration and funding. These recommendations include specific suggestions for making each of these areas more responsive to the needs of educationally disadvantaged children. (EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JAN 2 6 1979

ED173498

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

1979 SPECIAL REPORT

ON

THE NIE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION STUDY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NACEDC
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Suite 1012
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 724-0114

UD019589

TITLE I--FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 101. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in the following parts of this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

(20 U.S.C. 241a) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title I, sec. 2, 79 Stat. 27; redesignated and amended January 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title I, secs. 108(a) (2), 110, 81 Stat. 786, 787; amended April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, sec. 113(b) (2), 84 Stat. 126.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Sec. 148. (a) There shall be a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "National Council") consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment in the competitive service, for terms of three years, except that (1) in the case of initial members, five shall be appointed for terms of one year each and five shall be appointed for terms of two years each, and (2) appointments to fill vacancies shall be only for such terms as remain unexpired. The National Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(b) The National Council shall review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, including the effectiveness of programs to meet their occupational and career needs, and make recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation. These recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal educational programs for disadvantaged children and to the extent appropriate, experience under other public and private educational programs for disadvantaged children.

(c) The National Council shall make such reports of its activities, findings, and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) as it may deem appropriate and shall make an annual report to the President and the Congress not later than March 31 of each calendar year. Such annual report shall include a report specifically on which of the various compensatory education programs funded in whole or in part under the provisions of this title, and of other public and private educational programs for educationally deprived children, hold the highest promise for raising the educational attainment of these educationally deprived children. The President is requested to transmit to the Congress such comments and recommendations as he may have with respect to such report.

(20 U.S.C. 2411) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title I, sec. 2, 79 Stat. 34; amended Nov. 3 1966, P.L. 89-750, Title I, sec. 115, 80 Stat. 1197; redesignated and amended Jan. 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247 Title I sec. 108(a) (4) 110, 114, 81 Stat. 786-788; amended and redesignated April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, Title I, secs. 112, 113(b) (4), 84 Stat. 125, 126.

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Summary of the National Institute of Education Report	
	Background	1
	Chapter I	
	Demonstration Studies	4
	Chapter II	
	Teacher Training	8
	Chapter III	
	The Instructional Dimensions Follow-Up	14
	Chapter IV	
	Title I Parent Advisory Councils	16
	Chapter V	
	Local Administration of Title I	18
	Comments	22
	Nonpublic Schools Participation	22
	NIE Reports	23
	NIE Recommendations	24
II.	Summary of Previous Council Concerns	25
III.	Summary of Current Council Recommendations	28
	Summary of Council Legislative Recommendations	30
	Council Administrative Recommendations	30
IV.	Rational, Exposition and Development of Current Council Concerns	32
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS	33
VI.	Statements for the Future: Contemplated Research in the Education Amendments of 1978	38
	Evaluation	38
	Summer School Programs	43
	Secondary Schools	44
	Alternative Schools	45
	Nonpublic Schools	46
	Parent Involvement	47
	Coordination	48
	Conclusion	49
	NACEDC Officers and Committees 1978-79	50
	COUNCIL MEMBERS	inside back cover

MANDATED STUDIES

I. SUMMARY OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION REPORT

Background

Section 821 of the Education Amendments of 1974, (Public Law 93-380), instructed the National Institute of Education (NIE), to conduct a study of the purposes and effectiveness of compensatory education programs. Moreover, under Section 821, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC), was to advise the Institute on the design and execution of the study.

The study was to include such items as:

1. An examination of the fundamental purposes of such programs, and the effectiveness of such programs in attaining such purposes.

2. An analysis of means to identify accurately the children who have the greatest need for such programs in keeping with the fundamental purposes thereof.

3. An analysis of the effectiveness of methods and procedures for meeting the educational need of children, including use of individualized written educational plans for children, and programs for training the teachers of children.

4. An exploration of alternative methods, including the use of procedures to assess educational disadvantage, for distributing funds under such programs to states, to state educational agencies, and to local educational agencies in an equitable and efficient manner, which will accurately reflect current conditions and insure that such funds reach the areas of greatest current need and are effectively used for such areas.

5. Not more than 20 experimental programs, which shall be reasonably geographically representative, to be administered by the Institute, in cases where the Institute determines that such experimental programs are necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) through (4).....,

6. Findings and recommendations, including recommendations for changes in such Title I or for new legislation, with respect to the matters studied under clauses (1) through (5).

In addition, NIE was required to submit interim reports to the President and the Congress on December 31, 1976, on September 30, 1977, and a final report on September 30, 1978.

The research strategy used by NIE in carrying out its mission was to examine four major areas:

1. Funds allocation;
2. Service delivery;
3. Student development; and,
4. Program administration.

Six interim reports developed by NIE were issued and submitted to the NACEDC for their reactions. The NACEDC reacted to the reports and issued a report entitled, NACEDC Special Report on NIE Study on Compensatory Education.

NIE was funded to the extent of fifteen (15) million dollars; five (5) million dollars for each of the three years, which amounts were set aside from the regular Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 appropriations.

The Final Report of NIE completes their analyses and includes both follow-up data and additional information on ESEA, Title I operations. In addition to the follow-up to the examination of the aforementioned areas, NIE included in its Final Report, new information on the role of Parent Advisory Councils and the local administration of the ESEA, Title I programs, especially district and school planning and evaluation activities.

The five main chapters of the Final Report are as follows:

Chapter I.	Demonstration Studies
Chapter II.	Teacher Training
Chapter III.	The Instructional Dimensions Follow-up
Chapter IV.	Title I Parent Advisory Councils
Chapter V.	Local Administration of Title I

CHAPTER I

Demonstration Studies

This chapter focuses on the extent to which thirteen (13) demonstration school districts, that had special funds allocation procedures allowed in their Title I programs, were able to maintain or replicate the changes in the second year of implementation. Five areas are covered:

1. Changes in number of schools and students served by Title I;
2. Changes in the characteristics of students served by Title I;
3. Changes in the number of disadvantaged students covered by Title I services;
4. Simulations of the effects of achievement-based procedures not actually attempted by the districts; and
5. Changes in the services received by Title I students.

Of the five areas, number four (4) is new and was not part of the original experiment.

Data indicate that the demonstration districts maintained a substantial increase over the base line in the number of elementary schools and students served by Title I in the second year of implementation (1977-78). Just as in 1976-77, Title I expenditures were increased at the elementary level with greater use of carryover funds, and by reducing non-instruction or non-elementary instructional components. Also, the Title I teaching staff was supplemented with staff paid for by other sources, and the elementary program was restructured by slightly increasing the number of class periods, thus reducing the pupil/staff ratios.

As in 1976-77, there was a slight decrease in poor children in the Title I served group in 1977-78. Also, the proportion of minority children was slightly lower. These results were due to continued non-use of poverty criteria for school selection. However, inasmuch as the demonstration districts generally increased the numbers of children served by Title I, the absolute numbers of low achieving poor and minority students served were higher in each of the two implementation years, as computed with the base line.

The simulations of alternative allocation procedures carried out by NIE examined:

1. The effects of serving all schools with proportions of low achievers above the district average proportion; and

2. The effects of retaining poverty measures for school eligibility based on achievement versus poverty rankings.

The results of the simulations showed that serving all schools with above average proportions of low achievers would generate a larger number of students available for service than would the poverty-based procedures. In many cases, achievement based school eligibility may produce larger pools of low achievers, but generally the largest pools of eligible students are always selected by poverty. Also, NIE has pointed out that the very poor schools tend to be the very low achieving schools.

NIE summarizes that the demonstration districts were able to use a variety of methods to maintain the intensity and quality of services for each student during the two years of implementation.

The quality of instruction was considered positive. There were few changes in the type of teacher responsible for instruction in Compensatory Language Arts. Although there may have been some decreases in the Title I advantaged during the two years of implementation, the overall advantage for Title I students remains substantial.

The factors of increase in allocations, increase in use of carryover funds, reduction in non-instructional or non-elementary expenditures, donations of services to Title I from other fund sources, and the restructuring of the elementary instructional program, all contributed to the demands of services. Likewise, NIE has stated that perhaps the demonstration districts became more cost efficient, and were able to reevaluate their Title I programs and the redistribution of Title I resources. There is a caveat, however, as to whether the efficiency is a function of demonstration itself in the research project, or of the nature of the demonstration, and to what extent the waiver of normal regulations allowed for more efficient use of resources. Achievement based eligibility would select greater numbers of poor students.

With regard to changes in services, two indicators of instructional quality and quantity were considered. Instructional quality is concerned with:

1. Instructional group size, defined as the number of students within a class taught together for a particular activity; and
2. Type of teacher, defined as the person responsible for the activity.

More schools and students of the demonstration districts were served in the two implementation years compared with the base line, without an increase in the Title I allocation. The quantity of instruction was considered the total amount of time (minutes per day) spent by an "average" Title I student in language arts instruction. Districts maintained the basic integrity of the Title I program by administrative adjustments, slightly larger classes, emphasizing expenditures at the elementary level, and the use of some staff from other sources.

CHAPTER II

Teacher Training

In this chapter, NIE examines the training and qualifications of compensatory education teachers. The data examined by NIE were collected in 1975-76, in its survey of Compensatory Education which included a representative survey of Title I school instructors. NIE addressed itself to four questions:

1. To what extent do school instructors offer special training programs to their compensatory education teachers?
2. What types of training do districts offer?
3. How do districts select compensatory education teachers?
4. What are the qualifications of compensatory education teachers?

In addition, in determining the compensatory education teachers' qualifications, it examined:

1. highest degree level;
2. recent training; and
3. teaching experience.

The findings indicate that 73 percent of Title I districts offered training programs for the teachers. The training is typically informal, with reliance on short-term programs more so than on formal academic approaches. It pointed out that 90 percent of the Title I districts used three preferred strategies -- namely, consultations with specialists, staff meetings, and workshops.

It is interesting to note that in Table 17, District Ratings of the Importance of Various Training Methods, an introduction of new instructional techniques between very important, and somewhat important, totaled 100 percent. Other training content areas with total percentages for very important and somewhat important in descending order include:

..Measurement, evaluation and reporting, 96.5%

..Utilization of instructional equipment and material, 92/7%

..Introduction of new content material, 92.4%

..Educationally disadvantaged children, 86.3%

..Types of learning disabilities, 84.8%

..Project planning and design, 84.8%.

In the case of type of learning disabilities, very important was 42.6 percent, compared with 21.2 percent. For very important in Project planning and design, philosophy of compensatory education, 82.1 percent; utilization of other resources in the community, 62.8 percent, utilization of supportive services, 62.0 percent, and the lowest district rating was, instruction in a foreign language, 6.5 percent with 93.5 percent of not at all important.

Various training methods and the percentage of districts that use them include in descending order:

..Consultations with specialist not in the classroom, 96.7%

..Staff meetings, 90.2%

..Workshops, 89.7%

..Visits or demonstrations in the classroom, 59.6%

..Visiting, observing other teachers in their classroom, 56.7%

..Materials mailed to the teacher for his/her own use, 54.1%

..Special classes, 31.5%

..Courses for college credits 19.5%

..Video tapes of model teaching episodes, 16.1%

..Video tapes of teachers in teaching episodes, 5.0%.

Concerning the use of funds for teacher training, NIE points out that for fiscal year 1975, local educational agencies spent less than 0.5 percent of the total Title I budget on the programs. In the 1972-73, school year, according to the CONDITION OF EDUCATION (National Center for Education Statistics, 1976), approximately 18.5 million dollars, or one percent (1%) of Title I funds, were spent on teacher training.

There had been some question as to who might be training under Title I, but in 1976, the regulations were revised to clarify the intent of the law. Section 116.36(b), allows training funded for Title I staff members and for non-Title I staff specialists who will be dealing solely with children to be served by the Title I projects and with regular classroom teachers of such children.

The compensatory education teachers' qualifications related to three groups:

1. Compensatory education teachers who taught children in special compensatory programs;

2. Specialists who were teachers and who provided compensatory education instruction in only one area, such as reading, mathematics, language arts and other areas; and

3. Homeroom teachers who had the responsibility for taking attendance, and who had at least one compensatory education student in the classroom.

Most of the homeroom teachers did not give instruction in the compensatory education program.

It was revealed that the compensatory education teachers and the specialists had a much higher level of formal educational attainment than the homeroom teachers. Approximately ninty-six percent of the compensatory education teachers and the specialists have a bachelor's degree. On the other hand, approximately sixty-seven percent of the homeroom teachers have a bachelor's degree or plus. Approximately four percent of the compensatory education teachers and specialists have a bachelor's degree or less, as compared with approximately thirty-two percent of the homeroom teachers of compensatory education students who have a bachelor's degree or less. Likewise, the receiving of training of those three groups between June 15, 1975 and January 1, 1976, indicated that approximately sixty-four percent of the compensatory education teachers and specialists received training as compared with twenty-one percent of the homeroom teachers who had received training. In general, all three groups had approximately ten years of teaching experience.

NIE reports on the criteria and process for selecting teachers, and indicated from data obtained in the national survey that in sixty-one percent of the Title I districts, academic training in compensatory education was named as a key factor in selecting teachers for participation in a Title I program. Thirty-two percent of the districts considered experience in working with educationally disadvantaged children. Only eight percent of the districts used seniority as a selection criterion. Other criteria used by sixty-two percent of the districts included training in a subject area, attitudes toward compensatory education students, personal traits and supervisory opinions.

In eighty-two percent of the Title I districts, district personnel selected teachers. However, sixty-two percent of the districts reported the involvement of principals. Abouth thirty-three percent selected some Title I teachers from among those who had volunteered. Also, about eighteen percent of the district employed other methods of selection of teachers, including selection by parents.

In studying the relationship between selection methods and selection criteria to training content and training type, it was revealed that districts that had included district personnel as selectors were generally positive toward all content areas except planning, and were least likely to employ various training methods. Districts that allowed volunteering tended to be less instructional and less oriented but more concerned with instructional support. Districts using teacher seniority as a selection displayed less

concern about teacher training. Where principals were used as selectors, there was a greater concern in the districts with instruction and instructional support and less with theory. Finally, districts which used other methods and included parents as selectors seemed to be more theory oriented.

CHAPTER III

The Instructional Dimensions Follow-up

This chapter is a follow-up to the Instructional Dimensions Study (IDS), which was NIE's major study of the effects of services on compensatory education students. This follow-up study focuses upon the achievement gains of a sub-sample of over 400 students in selected first and third grade classrooms in fourteen school districts. Results indicated that over a seven month period, compensatory education students gained at a much higher rate than reported in earlier research.

However, inasmuch as this gain represented improvement over a school year, questions were raised as to the adequacies of school year evaluations as compared with calendar year assessment.

The two kinds of losses in learning over the summer have been reported. First, "relative loss," occurs when gains made over the summer by compensatory education students are fewer than those made by their higher achieving peers, and results in a relative decline in the achievement of compensatory education students. Second, is the "absolute loss," which is the actual forgetting of previously acquired knowledge, skills, and concepts during the summer months. In this loss, the achievement test scores of the students in compensatory education programs are lower in the fall than they were in the previous spring.

NIE conducted a follow-up study focused upon three questions:

1. Will the significant gains reported for the school year program be maintained?

2. If there is a summer dropping off, should it be characterized as an absolute or relative loss?

3. Do summer school programs have a positive effect on maintaining the rate of learning?

Approximately 3,000 students from twenty-seven schools in seven of the fourteen original school districts were included. The results of the testing, using the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, indicated that the students in compensatory education programs maintained gains over the calendar year; that is, on a twelve month basis. In the study, not only was the relative loss minimal, there was no absolute loss found. Also, the data indicated that in the summer programs offered by the seven districts in the study, there was not any increase in the achievement of students in compensatory education programs. Moreover, the study indicated that compensatory education students do not, as a rule, slip back during the summer. NIE does suggest that in order to examine the potential usefulness of summer programs more closely, additional information is needed. Such additional information would include:

1. how participants are selected;
2. which of the students selected actually attended;
3. how programs are structured; and
4. how the instruction offered in summer programs compared with student school year programs, and how the two are coordinated.

Also, NIE wisely points out how much depends upon the achievement test used. "It is possible, therefore, that whether or not there appears to be loss in learning over the summer depends on the particular achievement test used." - 15 -

CHAPTER IV

Title I Parent Advisory Councils

In this chapter, NIE describes the role and activities of Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) in ESEA, Title I Programs. Two major issues were examined:

1. the clarity of the PAC role and its responsibilities, and
2. the consistencies of practices among PACs, as well as toward PACs on the part of state and local officials.

Information is given for six areas:

1. The composition of PACs and how members are selected;
2. The frequency and substance of PAC meetings;
3. The role of the PACs as viewed by parents, local educational agencies, and state educational agencies;
4. The roles PAC members play in Title I planning and and other areas of involvement;
5. The kinds and extent of training provided the PAC members; and
6. The relationship of PACs to the evaluation process.

From the analysis of the data obtained in the six areas, there appears to be local variability in interpretation of the role of PACs. Also their operational characteristics vary widely, especially in their "advisory" role, which includes a range of possible parental roles, from instructional involvement to administrative decision making. In addition, studies also indicated that the state and local officials varied greatly in their concepts of PACs; moreover, PAC members differed in their own understanding about their functions,

duties and responsibilities. Likewise, it was further pointed out by NIE that even at the Federal level there is a variation in concepts about parent involvement and that a clear policy had not emerged. NIE does point out, however, "Exactly what is intended by the framers and supporters of the program requires considerable clarification."

CHAPTER V

Local Administration of Title I

This chapter concentrates on how local school districts perform their administrative responsibilities under Title I. A previous report had focused upon how Federal and state governments administer Title I.

NIE obtained descriptive information on local administration as part of its 1975-76 National Survey of Compensatory Education. It is pointed out that most districts plan for Title I activities by convening meetings in the late spring and the summer preceding the school year. Topics discussed at the meetings include needs assessment, evaluations, budget and parent participation. A very low percentage of all Title I principals and compensatory education teachers actually attend these planning meetings. The district plans are developed and defined in broad terms such as the Title I program, its goals, management schemes and general curricula.

However, at the school level there is much more involvement in the planning process. Research indicates that leadership from the principal and his/her involvement in planning and organizing the instructional program are necessary for the program's effectiveness. Studies pointed out by NIE show that where the principal is actively involved in coordination, planning, and setting priorities, the schools have higher achievement levels. Also, the exchange of ideas among staff, the participation of teachers in the planning process, and coordination among teachers, makes the program more effective.

In this chapter, NIE also provides data concerning the planning of meetings. This includes the frequency of meetings, who participates, available opportunities for the exchange of information, and coordination efforts at the school and district level. Topics discussed at both district and school level meetings included the following:

..needs assessment
..goal setting
..evaluation
..teaching techniques and approaches
..budget considerations
..parent participation
..coordination between regular classroom teachers of compensatory education students and teachers who also work with these students
..pre- or inservice compensatory education training and instructional planning.

Although few Title I principals and teachers appear to be involved in district planning meetings, the greater extent of school level planning where principals and teachers are involved provide more flexibility in designing programs and services to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged students. It is also important to note that at both levels parents were well represented. An encouraging aspect of the survey is that eighty-three percent of all compensatory teachers in reading, mathematics and language arts, indicated that they made some effort to coordinate their subject area with the instruction of regular classroom teachers.

With regard to evaluation, the teachers felt that the Title I testing programs in their districts were not reliable or valuable except as a mechanism for ranking students. Standardized tests did not, and could not, provide them with information that was useful in modifying or improving their approaches or techniques.

Some kind of formal evaluation, either state or locally organized, takes place in all but 2.4 percent of Title I districts. Ninety-five percent of those Title I districts which carry out evaluation activities rely primarily on standardized tests to measure the effects of Title I instruction on student development. Less than fifty percent of the districts include measures of noncognitive development in their evaluations of Title I instructional services.

Generally, the information from state and local district evaluations does not circulate below the district level. Only twenty percent of the Title I principals received the written results of the state evaluations, and only 26.7 percent received the results of district evaluations. Various aspects of the Title I programs which were considered in state and district evaluations included:

..effectiveness of supportive services
..teacher/pupil interaction
..teacher performance
..quality and availability of instructional materials
..use of aides and volunteers
..parent participation.

The survey results concluded that state and district evaluations results are not broadly disseminated to principals or teachers. When teachers did receive the results of the evaluation, they did not consider the information very useful as a tool for program change.

Concerning administrative costs, in its Compensatory Education Report of 1977, NIE pointed out that approximately $68 million, (four percent) of national expenditures paid for local administration.

Added to this were administrative expenses in a miscellaneous category of an additional $51 million. The maximum amounts of funds, therefore, spent for administrative purposes is approximately $119 million. The average number of FTE (full time equivalent) administrative staff in large school districts was 4.38 percent compared with .03 in small districts. Also, the percent of Title I expenditures for administration in large school districts was 3.8 percent as compared with 2.5 percent in small districts. Approximately eighty-five percent of the Title I districts had fewer than 4,359 pupils enrolled. Very few school districts have a separate Title I department. Usually, the Title I office was part of a special program office.

NIE pointed out that 94.6 percent of the district personnel responsible for administering Title I had some full-time teaching experience. Also, seventy-four percent of them had a previous administrative position either in the district or school, while twenty-six percent of the district Title I administrators went directly from teaching to district Title I administration. The average administrator had been in his/her position for approximately five years and had been employed in the district for an average of ten years.

COMMENTS

Concerning the role of the Council in the design and execution of the study, there is no information whatsoever given in the Final Report. There is no acknowledgement about any meetings with Council members and Council staff, nothing about the reactions of the Council to the NIE Interim Reports, or to the NACEDC Special Report on NIE Study on Compensatory Education. Also, there is no mention of any of the annual or special reports issued by the Council during the conduct of the study either within the main body of the report, or in the bibliographies at the end of each chapter. There may have been communication and interaction of NIE and the Council during the three-year study, but it is not evident in the Final Report.

Nonpublic Schools Participation

The nonpublic school sector is a vital part in the total educational establishment in this country. From the inception of ESEA, Title I in 1965, there has been involvement of nonpublic schools in insuring that educationally disadvantaged students attending nonpublic schools should be considered, within the prescribed regulations, eligible for instructional and supportive services fundable under Title I.

However, in the Final Report, with the exception of the item on page 6, indicating that Title I served 116,218 students in private schools, there is virtually no information about the nonpublic schools and their pupils. NIE may have studied the participation of nonpublic schools in its basic acquisition of information, but there is no evidence of such a study in the Final Report.

This omission of information about nonpublic school participation is even more significant considering that Congress, in its passage of the Education Amendments of 1978, indicates in Part D, General Administration Provisions, Office of Nonpublic Education, Section 1241, amends Section 403, of the General Education Provisions Act by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

> "(d)(1) There shall be, in the Office of Education, an Office of Nonpublic Education to insure the maximum potential participation of nonpublic school students in all Federal educational programs for which such children are eligible."

NIE Reports

A criterion for the usefulness of a report is the extent to which the recipient or reader of the report can gain information and then follow-up on, if the individual so desires. The NIE, in its Final Report of the Compensatory Education Study, indicated that it presented information from over thirty-five research projects. Considering that fifteen million dollars was allocated, it might have been helpful for NIE to include short summaries of the projects so that the reader of the report could obtain more information if the person thought it was warranted. The Council followed this procedure in its 1978 Annual Report to the President and the Congress by summarizing each of its site visits reports with the designation of a contact person. Also, unless for some reason, there was some degree of confidentiality, since the Council has a major responsibility concerning students who are educationally disadvantaged, copies of the contractors' studies from which NIE obtained its data

could have been helpful to the Council in its deliberations for follow-up and future action.

NIE Recommendations

The Final Report is the culmination of obtaining information from over thirty-five research projects. The research designs were well planned and documented. The studies were conducted by competent organizations. The many tables throughout the report, as well as the information in the appendices, indicate thoughtful and thorough approaches to several of the specific mandates for the study.

However, as one examines the six items listed under Section 821, which is the basis for NIE undertaking, it appears that the study is related to clauses (1 through 5). There does not seem to be any supportive evidence in the report which meets the mandate to include recommendations for changes in ESEA, Title I or for any legislation as to the needs studied under clauses (1 through 5). Much information is definitive in the report, but there is nothing specific as to whether one approach is recommended above another, or whether legislation, along certain lines, would be conductive to the improvement of compensatory education programs. Perhaps, NIE had a reason or was informed not to consider clause six (6), but there is nothing in the report that supports the idea of not offering recommendations for changes in ESEA, Title I, or any legislation.

II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONCERNS

In its Special Report on NIE Study on Compensatory Education, the Council offered several recommendations as follows:

..On-site visits and the monitoring for compliance as well as auditing are essential in determining to what extent states and school districts are carrying out the intent of Congress in the passage of the ESEA of 1965.

..Summer school programs include creative enrichment activities and new approaches to learning to reduce fall back in regular school practices.

..Federal and state program personnel and other outside resources such as college personnel, school personnel, including administrators and staff, be an integral part of evaluative activities.

..The future thrust in the use of funds for research and development on a national level be in the area of technical assistance for the improvement of programs at the local school level.

..The formal consent of the districtwide ESEA, Title I parent councils be required for research projects or evaluations which propose to waive the requirements of ESEA, Title I.

The Final Report of NIE does not address itself in any specific manner concerning the first recommendation regarding on-site visits and monitoring efforts. It does allude to this topic in its Interim Report on Administration of Compensatory Education. The Council as a follow-up to this concern of on-site visits and monitoring also recommended that additional staff for the Office of Education or the availability of more resources be given high priority to help provide additional assistance to states. Also, the Council emphasized the need for policy manuals for use by all those concerned with audits.

With regard to the recommendation on summer school programs, NIE does provide some information in its Final Report. However, information given by NIE related primarily to instructional programs in reading and mathematics, and to what extent achievement during the summer is sustained.

Information about creative activities and new approaches to learning to supplement traditional summer school practices is not considered.

Concerning the recommendation to use various resources for evaluative activities, there is practically nothing in the Final Report which relates to this recommendation. However, since there will be a sharper focus on evaluation as elaborated upon in the Education Amendments of 1978, the Council's recommendation on evaluation is very relevant.

As indicated earlier, in this report, NIE did not relate itself, especially to clause six (6), in offering recommendations for future action. Therefore, the Council again reaffirms its recommendation that research and development be in the area of technical assistance for the improvement of programs at the local school level. In the final analysis, what happens in the classroom will determine how effective educational practices can be for educationally disadvantaged students.

Concerning the recommendations that formal consent of the districtwide ESEA, Title I parent councils be required for research projects or evaluations which propose to waive the requirements of

ESEA, Title I, there is no information about this recommendation in the Final Report.

Summarizing, the several recommendations offered by the Council were not reacted to in any measurable degree by NIE, at least, as it is reflected in the Final Chapter.

III. SUMMARY OF COURRENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are taken primarily from the Council's Special Report on Mandated Studies submitted to the President and the Congress on March 31, 1979. Elaboration on these recommendations is given in Section 4, Rational, exposition and development of current Council concerns. The Council recommendations are as follows:

.. The U.S. Congress declare a moratorium on any new USOE and NIE studies of compensatory education until such time that the results of current studies have been fully evaluated and report to the U.S. Congress.

.. The future thrust in the use of funds for research and development on a national level be in the area of technical assistance for the improvement of programs at the local school level.

.. USOE discontinue the policy of providing technical assistance for program evaluations through technical assistance centers.

.. The Commissioner of Education undertake responsibility for organizing and implementing effective technical assistance capabilities within the Office of Education.

.. The primary objective of Title I programs be to raise the educationally disadvantaged child's level of achievement in the area of the basic skills (reading, mathematics, and language arts).

.. Future legislative mandates for national evaluation of the ESEA, Title I program incorporate specific purposes for the utilization of the information collected.

.. The Commissioner of Education improve the national dissemination of information concerning effective compensatory education program practices to all state and local educational agencies and to the education profession and the general public.

Besides these recommendations, an additional source of recommendations which merits review is the list of recommendations presented in the Council's 1978, Annual Report submitted to the President and the Congress on March 31, 1978.

In that report, the Council presents a Summary of Council Legislative and Administrative Recommendations. The Legislative Recommendations include recommendations of Reauthorization, Title I Formula, Audits, Parent Involvement, and Migrant Education. The Administrative Recommendations cover such areas as Compliance, Program Activities, Training, USOE Manuals, Indian Education, Migrant Education, and Parent Involvement.

The summary of these recommendations is presented herewith.

SUMMARY OF COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children recommends that:

Reauthorization

- ESEA, Title I should be reauthorized and expanded.
- Sufficient funds should be appropriated to serve the currently eligible population who are not participating in Title I programs.
- The dual criteria which serve educationally disadvantaged children in areas of high concentrations of low income families be retained.
- ESEA, Title I advanced funding provisions be refined so that local educational agencies are informed by February 1 of the preceding fiscal year the total amount of allocations to be forthcoming.
- Not less than 80 percent of Title I funds be concentrated on the basic skills of reading, mathematics and language arts.
- Extra resources be targeted toward areas with the highest concentrations of low income families.
- The ceiling on state administrative costs and the minimum floor be raised.

Title I Formula

- The formula be redesigned to withdraw the discrimination against the areas with the highest concentration of low income families.
- The AFDC be used once again as one of the formula factors.
- Differentials reflecting higher costs in urban areas be added to the formula.
- The eligibility age for count in the Title I formula should be lowered to the age of three.
- The formula should take into account variances in regional costs.

Audits

- States be required to spend on Title I eligible children the amount they would otherwise have had to return to the U.S. Treasury as a result of audit exceptions.
- State departments of education personnel should accompany HEW audit teams.

Parent Involvement

- The formal consent of the districtwide ESEA Title I parent council should be required for research projects or evaluations which propose to waive the requirements of ESEA, Title I.
- The Federal Government should prescribe all parent involvement regulations required under ESEA, Title I, in the pattern established by every other Title I regulation.
- The state administrative set-aside should be examined by the Congress and increased appropriately to allow technical assistance for state support of parent training activities.
- The National Institute of Education should be required by Congress to develop a simplified summary of its reports for dissemination to parent advisory council members and other interested persons.

Migrant Education

- Provisions should be made to consider the emancipated child eligible for service under the migrant program, if that child is a migrant in a job classification covered under the ESEA Title I statute regulations.
- Provisions should be made for the migrant child to be eligible for services from federal funded migrant programs regardless of the fact that the parent's employment varies from the statutory job classification.
- The five-year provision for out-of-stream migrants continue.

COUNCIL ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children recommends that:

Compliance

- State resources spent on compensatory education programs be excluded from the comparability computation if they serve economically and educationally disadvantaged children.
- On-site visits and the monitoring for compliance as well as auditing should be conducted to determine the extent States and school districts are carrying out the intent of Congress in the passage of the ESEA of 1965.
- Federal and State program personnel and other outside resources such as college personnel, school personnel, including administrators and staff should be an integral part of evaluative activities.

Program Activities

- Implementation of individualized educational plans for eligible Title I students be improved.
- Summer school programs should include creative enrichment activities and new approaches to learning in order to reduce fall-back in regular school practices.
- Preschool services be provided to preschool-aged children as a high priority of service with funds allowed under ESEA Title I.

Training

- Inservice training should be expanded to include opportunities for inner-city school principals.
- Training components become an integral part of the staff development in compensatory education.
- Evaluation of local school's Title I programs include examination of inservice training activities provided for parent advisory council members, the timeliness of materials provided for parent advisory council review and comment and the opportunity for all parents of children in eligible attendance areas to express their views on the programs provided via the Council mechanism.

U.S.O.E. Manuals

- A manual be developed by the U.S. Office of Education to clarify regulations on instructional styles which are legal.
- Subject headings be included in manuals or brochures prepared by the U.S. Office of Education, especially if the topic duplicates applicable regulations.

Indian Education

- The Congress review the major educational program servicing Indian children and establish within the legislation a comprehensive system for the collection and dissemination of information concerning Indian Education programs.
- Cross-agency coordination of Indian educational programs be facilitated through legislative action to reduce the need of duplication of efforts at the local level.
- The Bureau of Indian Affairs and Civil Service Commission develop an alternative procedure to allow for educational personnel selection and evaluation at the local educational agency.
- In instances where documented hardship occurs in acquiring educational equipment, special provisions for "emergency" purchases outside the General Services Administration be permitted.

Program Activities

- Title I services follow the child where possible in situations where school district reorganize due to segregation and where declining enrollment alters the Title I attendance areas.
- The Congress relieve data collection hardships by amending Title I to reduce unnecessary paperwork.

Migrant Education

- Exchange of migrant student credits among states be facilitated by the Migrant Record Transfer System's accrual of time and content of courses completed and units of credit attained.
- That Section 116.39(d) of the Migrant Regulations be deleted as unnecessary.
- Regulatory provisions be included to speed up the delivery of funds to providers of service.

Parent Involvement

- The definition of parents of eligible children in target school should be modified to include parents of all children attending such school and parents of pre-school and high school children living in the local school's attendance area.
- Local educational agencies should be required to attach written responses to parent advisory council's recommendations appropriate to the application in each instance of filing and/or written revision of the application. The response should include the reasons for accepting or rejecting the recommendation.
- Elected parent advisory council officers should have the independence of setting up their own meeting schedules.
- All parent advisory council members should be elected and that the minimum percentage of members who must be parents of eligible children remain a simple majority.
- The most cost-effective method of parent training be primarily a local activity with additional funds provided for technical assistance from state, regional and national offices.
- Technical assistance for parent training be arranged through utilization of the ten regional technical assistance laboratories already established by the Office of Education to give individualized assistance to states and locals.

IV. RATIONALE, EXPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CURRENT COUNCIL CONCERNS

The Council is charged with the responsibility to review and evaluate the administration and operation of ESEA, Title I, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children. Taking into consideration the effectiveness of the program to meet the occupational and career needs of these children, the Council is then required to make recommendations for the improvement of ESEA, Title I, as well as its administration and operation. The Council also makes reports on its activities, findings and recommendations -- especially on which compensatory education programs hold the highest promise for raising the educational attainment of educationally deprived children.

In order to carry out its mission, the Council undertakes a variety of activities such as: on-site visitations of programs, participate in a variety of seminars, conferences, panels, meetings, and workshops under the auspices of national, state and local agencies. Council members conduct regional meetings and informal hearings at the state and local levels, and review literature, including research reports on educationally disadvantaged children and youth. Members meet and work with various Federal agencies, for example, USOE, NIE, and others, and the Council reacts to studies such as the NIE Interim Reports. The Council also reviews information that it receives regarding the interest and concern of the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government.

Likewise, it solicits and receives advice, suggestions, and comments from state and local agencies, as well as from parents; public and private interest groups; disadvantaged students and their parents; educational specialists; and other groups that may be interested in the educationally disadvantaged.

The Council culls from all of its sources of information what it deems essential to carry out the mandate of Congress. On the basis of its deliberations, Council then offers recommendations to the President and the Congress. The Council is concerned with many facets of ESEA, Title I implementation, and includes such areas as:

.. program development
.. adequate funding
.. proper and effective utilization of funds
.. establishment of priorities
.. research and evaluation
.. compliance with regulations
.. legislative aspects
.. Title I formula
.. audits
.. parental involvement

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The U.S. Congress declare a moratorium on any new USOE and NIE studies of compensatory education until such time that the results of current studies have been fully evaluated and reported to the U.S. Congress.

In the publication, Today's Education (NEA), in the February-March 1979, issue, there is an article entitled, Impact of Public Law 95-561, by Congressman Carl D. Perkins, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor and its Committee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education. Congressman Perkins stated that one theme that ran throughout the testimony on the proposed legislation

was, "These programs are beginning to work; now is not the time for radical change." He also stated that "Our committee heard evidence based on evaluations and other research and from individual testimony that revealed a higher level of achievement for these programs, than when we had last looked at them in 1974."

The Council supports Chairman Perkins' observation and had reported in its 1978 Annual Report that the Council has determined through its examinations of ESEA, Title I, that the services provided at the local level significantly increase the educational achievement levels of educationally disadvantaged children.

The future thrust in the use of funds for research and development on a national level be in the area of technical assistance for the improvement of programs at the local school level.

ESEA, Title I has been in existence for fourteen (14) years and there has never been a time when all of the eligible, educationally disadvantaged children were served. USOE statistics have estimated that no more than sixty-six percent of the children eligible for ESEA, Title I actually received services in 1977. Some states have tried to provide for services for those who were not able to participate or even supplement services for those who did participate, but tightness of funds, unemployment, inflation, taxpayer' revolts, welfare and other factors are straining federal and state resources. Any funds which become available should be directed to the main area where ultimately definitive action will take place and that is in the classroom.

USOE discontinue the policy of providing technical assistance for program evaluations through technical assistance centers, and furthermore, that the Commissioner of Education undertake responsibility for organizing and implementing effective technical assistance capabilities within the Office of Education.

The Council believes that the expertise which the USOE has acquired over fourteen (14) years of participation in Title I, and related programs including the planning, development, implementation, follow-up, and evaluation activities should enable the USOE to provide technical assistance to the states without incurring additional expenditures for outside technical assistance centers. The funds used for the maintenance of the technical assistance centers would better be used for helping to meet the needs of the estimated thirty-four percent of educationally disadvantaged students who are eligible for Title I programs and services, but do not receive them.

The primary objective of Title I programs be to raise the educationally disadvantaged child's level of achievement in the area of the basic skills (reading, mathematics, and language arts).

Patricia A. Graham, Director of the National Institute of Education, has indicated in an article entitled, "Let's Get Together on Educational Research," in the February-March 1979 issue of Today's Education, (NEA) that three general problems are initial difficulties in educational research:

1. We have demanded too much from our education system;
2. The problem of finding appropriate methodologies for studying educational problems; and
3. The selection of significant topics for research.

She further states that, "We must recognize that the primary reason we educate people is not for salvation, morality, or nobility; but for literacy. Education may have other useful side effects, but literacy must be our first goal."

The Council concurs wholeheartedly with Dr. Graham's primary priority of literacy and has continually emphasized that programs, research and evaluation be directed to improving the educational program especially at the classroom level. In the final analysis, the interaction between the teacher and the student in the classroom is basic to remediating educational disadvantages. Other factors including the leadership role of the principal, curriculum materials, supportive services, teaching methodology, parental involvement and community support, are complementary to this interrelationship of teacher and student.

Future legislative mandates for national evaluation of the ESEA, Title I program incorporate specific purposes for the utilization of the information collected.

NIE, in its Interim Report on Compensatory Education Services, (pages 20 and 55), points out that a wide variety of programs and services are available for school districts in their Title I programs. Besides the basic instructional services such as in reading, mathematics and language arts, English as a second language and special education and learning disabilities, there was a variety of auxiliary services funded by ESEA, Title I. Some of the auxiliary services included such items as libraries, health services, counseling,

transportation, food, clothing, resource centers, medical/dental, psychiatric and diagnostic, speech and hearing therapy, and parent involvement in activities.

> The Commissioner improve the national dissemination of information concerning effective compensatory education program practices to all state and local educational agencies and to the education profession and the general public.

The Council has found in its on-site visits many effective compensatory education practices. Identification of these effective practices and their dissemination can provide an impetus and motivation for school districts to initiate similar program practices. The dissemination of effective compensatory education program practices should be of high priority in order to assist school districts from "reinventing the wheel," and providing examples of what is working.

VI. STATEMENTS FOR THE FUTURE: CONTEMPLATED RESEARCH IN THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1978

Evaluation

Research and evaluation are essential parts of the educational process. These activities help to determine to what extent a program is being implemented according to its purpose and objectives; to what extent students have gained or not gained as a result of participation in a program, what the strengths and weaknesses of the program are; and finally, what should be accomplished in order to make it more effective. In addition, Congress desires research and evaluation studies so as to be guided along future directions concerning a program.

Under the Education Amendments of 1978, there are several types of evaluation studies mandated by Congress that are Title I related. The Office of Evaluation and Dissemination (OED), will be involved in a number of evaluation activities. Section 183, which is concerned with Program Evaluation, lists the following areas:

- Independent Evaluations
- Evaluation Standards and Schedules
- Jointly Sponsored Studies
- Evaluation Models
- Technical Assistance
- Specification of Objective Criteria
- Report to Congress
- Information Dissemination
- Maximum Expenditures

The OED is presently involved in several evaluation activities related to ESEA, Title I.

The Study of Sustaining Effects of Compensatory Education, is being carried out by the Systems Development Corporation of California. The starting date was 1975, and the estimated ending date is December 1980. The study is budgeted for $12 million, over five years, and is designed primarily to determine whether achievement gains are sustained, and if so, for how long. The areas being studied include reading, mathematics and language arts.

Another evaluation study, Evaluation of Migrant Education Programs, is being conducted by the Research Triangle Institute, of North Carolina. Starting date was February 1976, and the anticipated ending date is May 1980. Cost of the study is expected to be $3.3 million.

The Development of Evaluation Models for Early Childhood Programs is being carried out by Huron Institute, of Massachusetts. The starting date was September 1977, and the estimated ending date is May 1979. Estimated cost for this project is $450,000.

Another current activity of the OED is the establishment and maintenance of ten (10) Title I Evaluation Technical Assistance Centers. These centers were established in October 1976, and are to be continued under the present arrangement until September 1979. Cost for these centers is estimated at $7 million, for the period from January 1978 to March 1979. The Council had previously recommended that the Technical Assistance Centers be phased out and that the Commissioner of Education undertake responsibility for organizing and implementing effective technical assistance capabilities within the Office of Education.

NIE will again, be involved in evaluation activities and is charged by Congress to conduct a study to assess parental involvement and training. Section 125(f) of the Education Amendments of 1978, reads as follows:

> "(f) ASSESSMENT OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND TRAINING-- The National Institute of Education shall assess the effectiveness of (1) various forms of parental involvement, including parent advisory councils, on school governance, student achievement, and other purposes of this title, and (2) various methods of training the members of parent advisory councils, and shall report the results of such assessments to the Congress and the public."

A third mandate for evaluation in the Act deals with school financing. Congress is wisely grappling with the complex problem of financing elementary and secondary education.

Equalization of resources, disparity in expenditures among school districts, price differentials, pupil/teacher ratios and current declining school enrollments, are several factors which affect the financing of schools. Also under School Finance, studies and surveys will be carried out to determine the capacity of educational finance systems to provide adequate school revenues, to examine future trends in educational service requirements, cost of supplying these services and availability of school revenues from Federal, state and local sources.

Section 1203(a) of the Act indicates the general scope of concern which Congress has in regard to school financing. The purpose of this section is to provide for:

"(1) the availability of reliable and comparative data on the status and trends in financing elementary and secondary education;

(2) the conduct of studies necessary to understand and analyze the trends and problems affecting the financing of elementary and secondary education, both public and nonpublic, including the prospects for adequate financing during the next ten (10) years; and

(3) the development of recommendations for Federal policies to assist in improving the equity and efficiency of Federal and state systems for raising and distributing revenues to support elementary and secondary education."

Furthermore, Congress has established an Advisory Panel on Financing Elementary and Secondary Education to provide advice and counsel.

Section 1203(c) states:

"(1) In order to provide the Secretary and the Congress with advice and counsel from distinguished and knowledgeable members of the public on the conduct of the activities authorized under this section, there is established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Advisory Panel on Financing Elementary and Secondary Education to be composed of fifteen (15) members appointed by the President. The Panel shall include: (a) representatives of public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education, including board members, administrators, and teachers, (b) state and local officials, (c) citizens, and (d) scholars of school finance."

To pay for these studies, Congress has indicated the sources of funds under Section 1203(h).

"(h) Sums made available pursuant to section 183, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and other funds available to any agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for purposes consistent with this section, shall be available to carry on the provisions of this section."

The Council endorses evaluative studies, but is concerned about using funds from ESEA, Title I for these purposes. The Council recommends that separate funds should be authorized with proper appropriations for evaluation activities, in order to achieve the primary purpose of ESEA, Title I funds -- namely, for direct benefits and services to educationally disadvantaged students. Also, the Council had previously recommended the use of outside resources and reiterates the specific recommendation as given in the NACEDC Special Report on NIE Study on Compensatory Education.

> "Federal and state program personnel and other outside resources such as college personnel, school personnel, including administrators and staff, be an integral part of evaluative activities. The formal consent of the districtwide ESEA, Title I parent councils be required for research projects or evaluations which propose to waive the requirements of ESEA, Title I."

Additional areas of research and evaluation in the Act in which ESEA, Title I may be directly or indirectly involved, include Title II, Basic Skills, especially, Section 210, "Coordination." This "Coordination," involves establishing effective and efficient procedures for coordination of basic skills with other titles such as Title I, and Title IV, Educational Improvement, Resources, and Support; Title V, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; Title V, Higher Education Act of 1965; and, other such Federal programs that support efforts to improve the basic skills of children, youth and adults.

Also, Title VII, Bilingual Education Research and Development which has $20,000,000 authorized for national research programs for

bilingual education. Congress has indicated in Section 742(c), that there should be periodic consultation by the Commissioner of Education and the Director of the National Institute of Education with representatives of state and local educational agencies and appropriate groups and organizations involved in bilingual education.

A new title, Title VIII, "Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act of 1978," also contains an item for research. Section 813(a) provides that NIE shall carry out a program of research on community education programs including an analysis of program impact with respect to individuals and communities, the importance of parental involvement, school vandalism and violence, and the effect of nonfederal funds contributed. Section 813(b) provides for one million dollars to NIE for fiscal year 1979, and also for each succeeding fiscal year, prior to October 1, 1983, for research purposes.

The OED and NIE will be heavily involved in research and evaluation activities, yet there are several areas which pertain to ESEA, Title I, which could be considered for research and evaluation.

Summer School Programs

As previously indicated NIE treated summer school programs very briefly in their Final Report. This included some information regarding evaluation on a calendar year, some of which related primarily to instruction programs. The Council had recommended that summer school programs include creative enrichment activities and new approaches to learning in order to reduce fallback in regular

school practices. There appear to be several variations concerning the impact of the period of summer as to the retention of material learned during the regular school year. The Council supports the recommendation of Congress and especially in Section 124(k), SUSTAINING GAINS:

> "(k) SUSTAINING GAINS-- A local educational agency may receive funds under this title only if, in developing programs to be assisted under this title, the local educational agency will give due consideration to the inclusion of components designed to sustain the achievements of children beyond the school year in which the program is conducted, through such means as summer programs and intermediate and secondary level programs."

It would be helpful to conduct an indepth study covering the points cited in the above section on Sustaining Gains.

Secondary Schools

Emphasis, and rightfully so, in ESEA, Title I programs is directed towards elementary school problems. As both preventive and remediation measures, it is desirable that elementary school children be afforded the opportunity of acquiring relevant educational experience and participation in the early stages of acquiring literacy. However, it is also important that students in the secondary schools be given ample opportunity to correct their deficiencies, for the reason that in the case of many students, high school is the last formal institution of education. Leading factors in dropping out of school are the lack of motivation and interest in school. In many instances, this situation is related to inability to read, to do simple mathematics, to express oneself, or to write legibly according to the degree of achievement which a secondary school student

should possess in these areas. This condition has to be rectified! Furthermore, although career education is a continuum throughout schooling as to how individuals can earn a living and how the various careers contribute to society, it is in the secondary schools specifically that greater focus is directed towards career education in its role of preparing students to acquire salable skills and work towards an occupation. Congress recognized this need and accordingly, in Part F, General Provisions, Education Amendments of 1978, Section 196(b), National Advisory Council, it is stated:

> "Function-- The National Advisory Council shall review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, including the effectiveness of programs to meet their occupational and career needs, and make recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operations."

Therefore, the Council recommends that a study be undertaken either by the OED or by the NIE on secondary school programs.

Alternative Schools

The number of dropouts attest to the fact that the school is not meeting the needs of a certain segment of the student body. Causes vary, but may include: lack of curricular experiences sufficient to encourage motivation; family concerns; peer pressure; problems particular to the individual; or insufficient finances. Nevertheless, the fact remains that there are students who lack enough motivation to remain in school.

Alternative schools are considered one means for enabling students to receive an education other than the normal structure of the secondary school -- as it is known today. The alternative school can be modified in varying directions: greater flexibility; more curricular experiences better suited to motivate and encourage students in learning; smaller classes; greater degree of rapport between students and teachers; less restrictive environment; and locations differing from those of the regular school.

Especially in consideration of the mandate by Congress respecting the responsibilities directed to the Council concerning occupational and career needs, it would be desirable to determine what alternative provisions do exist that would provide sufficient incentive to students in continuing in school, especially in the direction of occupational and career needs.

Nonpublic Schools

As stated previously, nonpublic schools are an integral part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Section 130(a) General Requirements, of the Act, which relates to PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS, and also Section 130(b) BYPASS PROVISION, attest to Congress' desire to insure that eligible educationally disadvantaged students who attend private schools, which include nonpublic schools, should be given the opportunity to participate in programs and receive services under ESEA, Title I.

In the Interim Report, Evaluating Compensatory Education, (December 30, 1976), a proposed study was entitled, Private School

Students' Involvement in the Title I Program. This project basic purpose was to determine the degree to which Title I, is providing private school students with the services to which they are entitled (page B74). The contractor was the Council on American Private Education, and the anticipated completion of the project was November 1977. If there were some information about private school participation it should have been disseminated. Otherwise, the Council recommends that in future studies, a study be made of participation by private school children in ESEA, Title I programs, and services in order to insure that the intent of Congress is carried out.

Parent Involvement

The Council has long been an advocate of parent involvement in ESEA, Title I and in its Special Report on Parent Involvement, elaborates on its advocacy role. It concurs with the specific charge to NIE as stated in Section 125(f) of the Act, which is previously cited.

Besides the specific items to be assessed, the Council would also recommend that an additional item be considered. Specifically, "What impact did participation in a parent advisory council have on the individual member of the council? For example, did any of the parents, as a result of participating in a parent advisory council, further their own education and/or their career goals, and if so, to what extent?"

Coordination

A significant component of a sound administrative and management system is that there be coordination of resources impacting on the objective. Besides ESEA, Title I, there are state and local compensatory education funds that are used within the school district. The Council believes that in establishing models it would be helpful that there be detailed study of various kinds of administrative set-ups and several guards to insure that various sources of compensatory education funds are coordinated. For example, how do some of the states in which there are state and local compensatory education funds supplement ESEA, Title I funds? How are ESEA, Title I funds coordinated with other programs, such as bilingual, neglected and delinquent, handicapped, Indian, migrant, and so forth? What types of organizations exist to carry out this coordination?

NIE touched briefly on this topic by indicating that very few districts have a separate Title I department, but that Title I is part of some type of special program office. The report also indicated that the basic organizational structure varies considerably in local school districts. A detailed study of administrative organizations of state as well as district and school level can help produce desirable models for successful coordination of resources to maximize the use of funds and minimize duplication and overlapping.

CONCLUSION

With the extension of ESEA, Title I until 1983, there will have been eighteen (18) years of implementation of the program. Now is the time to insure that for each succeeding year, ESEA, Title I and related programs are conducted effectively and efficiently.

It is important to continue to redress inequities in our society and the programs passed by Congress can be a vehicle to realize this objective.

NACEDC OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES 1978-79

Owen F. Peagler, Chairman
Carol Schwartz, Vice Chairman
Wilbur H. Lewis, Vice Chairman

Urban Education Committee

Sarah M. Greene, Chairman
John Leopold
Carol Schwartz
George Willeford
M. Alan Woods

Migrant Education Committee

Ben Reifel, Chairman
Mary Anne Clugston
John Calhoun
Rosella Lipson
Wilbur H. Lewis

Mandated Studies Committee

Dorothy Fleegler, Chairman
J. Alan Davitt
Rosella Lipson
M. Alan Woods

Title I Eligible Nonpublic Students

J. Alan Davitt, Chairman
Sarah M. Greene
Wilbur H. Lewis

Executive Committee

Owen F. Peagler, Chairman
Carol Schwartz, Vice Chairman
Wilbur H. Lewis, Vice Chairman
Dorothy Fleegler
Sarah M. Greene
Ben Reifel

NACEDC STAFF

Roberta Lovenheim, Executive Director
Gloria Strickland, Assistant Executive Director
Paul Keller, Senior Program Analyst
Marcia Wilson, Program Analyst
Lisa Haywood, Secretary

Consultants to the Council

Dr. Irving Ratchick
161 Brevator Street
Albany, New York 12206

Mrs. Jody Ward Starr
300 E. 40th Street
New York, New York 10016

★U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979 O—626-740/1666 REGION 3-1

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Rosella Lipson
President
Preschool Mobile Foundation, Inc.
802 North Sierra Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90210
Term expires 9/15/77

Mary Anne (McCabe) Clugston
Guidance Counselor
Hogback Trading Post
Waterflow, New Mexico 87421
Term expires 9/15/77

Ben Reifel
Retired Member of Congress
2505 South Kiwanis
Apartment No. 307
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57105
Term expires 9/15/77

Carol L. Schwartz (Vice Chairman)
Vice President
D.C. Board of Education
Suite 1205
415 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Term expires 9/15/77

George Willeford, M.D.
Child Psychiatrist
720 W. 34th Street
Austin, Texas 78703
Term expires 9/15/77

J. Alan Davitt
Executive Secretary
New York State Council of Catholic
School Superintendents
11 North Pearl Street
Albany, New York 12207
Term expires 9/15/78

Dorothy Fleegler
Executive Committee
Center for Children and Youth
in the State of Florida
Box 5497
Boca Raton, Florida 33432
Term expires 9/15/78

Sarah Moore Greene
Vice Chairman
Knoxville Board of Education
701 E. Vine Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37915
Term expires 9/15/78

Wilbur H. Lewis (Vice Chairman)
7552 E. Knollwood Circle
Tucson, Arizona 87515
Term expires 9/15/78

Owen F. Peagler (Chairman)
Dean
School of Continuing Education
Eastern Connecticut State College
Willimantic, Connecticut 06226
Term expires 9/15/78

John Leopold
Apartment #908
700 Richards Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Term expires 9/15/79

John Calhoun
Educator and Businessman
2816 Hewitt Avenue
Wheaton, Maryland 20906
Term expires 9/15/79

M. Alan Woods
106 S. Lee Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Term expires 9/15/79